REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Entry of the above amendments, and reconsideration of the claim rejections, as they might apply to the original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-21 remain in the application. In this Response, claims 15-21 have been amended. Claims 3-7 and 10-14 remain in their original form.

**A.   Rejection of Claims
Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Item 2 In The Office Action

The Examiner has rejected claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 15-21 as suggested by the Examiner to read "machine-readable storage medium" rather than "tangible machine-readable medium."

Applicant believes that claims 15-21 as amended, are now statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to a process, and accordingly, Applicant requests retraction of the Examiner's rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

**B.   Rejection of Claims
Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Item 3 In The Office Action

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Allen et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 20050028162 A1.

Applicant respectfully traverses. The Examiner in the Office Action has failed to state a *prima facie* case of anticipation. A *prima facie* case of anticipation can be met only where the reference teaches each and every aspect of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 706.02.

Regarding independent claims 1, 8, and 15, Allen et al. fails, at a minimum, to teach or suggest the following:

generating a code by **compiling an application source file and a project file** of the application source file; (as claimed in claims 1, 8, and 15)

receiving a resource identifier from the application source file indicating a resource to be utilized by the application, wherein **the resource identifier does not indicate a protocol or a location for the resource**; (as claimed in claims 1, 8, and 15)

locating the resource based on the resource identifier and the code generated during compilation of the application; (as claimed in claims 1, 8, and 15)It is incumbent on the Examiner to particularly point out how the invention is anticipated by the prior art. The Examiner has rejected clams 1-21 over <u>Allen et al.</u> by repeating the claim language verbatim and then citing to all but two paragraphs of the entire detailed description of the invention (paragraphs 0017-0028) with no indication or specificity as to where the individual elements of the claims are taught. The Examiner's rejection amounts to no more than an omnibus rejection of the claims "on the references and for the reasons of record." *See* MPEP 707.07(d) "Improperly Expressed Rejections." This type of claim rejection is not helpful to the Applicant because it denies the Applicant the opportunity to understand the Examiner's logic and thinking about the claims in light of the prior art, and thus makes it difficult for the Applicant to form a reasoned response. The Examiner's response can be summarized as saying that claims 1-21 are rejected over <u>Allen et al.</u> because the reference teaches the same thing as claimed in claims 1-21. This is not helpful at all.

Applicant's review of <u>Allen et al.</u> finds no teaching of a **code** being generated by **compiling an application source file and a project file** of the application source file. Indeed, the words "compile," "compiled," "source file," and "project file" do not appear anywhere in <u>Allen et al.</u> <u>Allen et al.</u> discloses a method for dynamically adding resources in a web application server, wherein the web application server includes at least one web application and a resource lookup web application. A new resource is detected by the resource lookup web application, and is installed into the resource lookup web application. Once installed, the resource lookup web application "advertises" the new resource to the web application and may subsequently receive a request for the new resource from the web application.

Applicant's invention generates a **code** by **compiling an application source file and a project file** of the application source file. A **resource identifier** from the application source file indicates a resource needed by the application. However, that resource identifier **does not indicate a protocol or a location for the resource** (as claimed in claims 1, 8, and 15). In Allen et al., after the new resource has been advertised to the web application, in order for the web application to access the newly added resource to the resource lookup web application, the web application must initiate a Servlet API call "get ServletContext( ).get Context(url). (See paragraphs [0020] and [0027]. Thus, **the complete URL is required** in order for the web application to access the newly provided, or for that matter, any previously existing, Java resource associated with the resource lookup web application. Applicant's invention, on the other hand, specifically teaches, and claims in independent claims 1, 8, and 15, that "the resource identifier **does not indicate a protocol or a location for the resource**" that is needed by the application. The resource is then located by utilizing the **resource identifier** and the **code** generated during **compilation of the application.** Allen et al. does not compile an application to generate a code that is used in conjunction with a resource identifier from the application source file.

Since the Allen et al. reference does not disclose expressly or inherently all of the elements and limitations of Applicant's independent claims 1, 8, and 15, the Allen et al., reference does not meet the statutory standard and should be withdrawn. Thus, Applicant believes that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are not anticipated by Allen et al. Accordingly, Applicant requests retraction of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 8, and 15, and include all the elements and limitations thereof. As a result, and in light of the foregoing remarks concerning independent claims 1, 8, and 15, Applicant likewise believes that dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 also overcome the Examiner's rejection based on Allen et al. under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) since as argued, one or more of the elements of independent claims 1, 8, and 15, are not taught or disclosed by Allen et al., and withdrawal of that rejection in respect to these claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

This Amendment fully responds to the Final Office Action mailed on November 15, 2007. Still, that Office Action may contain arguments and rejections that are not directly addressed by this Amendment due to the fact that they are rendered moot in light of the preceding arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicant believes the argument has merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Thus, a bona-fide attempt has been made to ensure that the application meets all statutory requirements and is in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early indication to that effect is, therefore, courteously solicited. If a telephone conference would expedite allowance or resolve any additional questions, such a call is invited at the Examiner's convenience.

Applicant does not believe that any fees are due with this response. If this is not the case, please charge all required fees, or fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17, or all required extension of time fees due, or credit any overpayment to, deposit account 13-2725. Please consider this a Petition For Extension Of Time for a sufficient number of months to enter this correspondence, or any future reply, if appropriate, for an extension of time for its timely submission.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(303) 357-1632

By: _____
Stanley J. Gradisar, Esq., Reg. No. 42,598
Attorney for Applicant

Date: February 15, 2008

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE